



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,415	02/25/2002	Hongyi Zhou	CU-2844 RJS	3274
26530	7590	08/30/2006	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604			AILES, BENJAMIN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/069,415

Applicant(s)

ZHOU, HONGYI

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 10-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 10, 11, 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-6, 10-26 remain pending. Claims 12-17 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07 June 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tout (US 6,182,148).
5. Regarding claim 18, Tout discloses a system of intelligent information processing in the Internet comprising:

means for inputting a query string of words (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for identifying whether an input of words is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for querying the input in a corresponding server through the Internet, and directly obtaining the query result therefrom if the input is a regular URL (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for parsing the input against at least one phonetic spelling word list to find out corresponding Internet keyword, and then fetching a corresponding query result if the input includes the native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33); and

means for processing the input as a natural language input in a natural language table, and obtaining a desired Internet keyword, and fetching a corresponding query result of website URL if the input includes characters of a native language (col. 5, lines 18-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tout in view of Maruyama et al. (US 5,835,924), hereinafter referred

Art Unit: 2142

to as Maruyama, and further in view of Bates et al. (US 6,873,982), hereinafter referred to as Bates.

8. Regarding claim 1, Tout teaches a method of processing in the Internet comprising parsing of a query string input to a web browser (col. 5, lines 18-33) by a user in order to translate international domain names and retrieve a list of Internet keywords (col. 5, ll. 18-33). Tout does not explicitly recite the input string being compared to a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List (FCPWL), to split the query string into one or more Chinese phonetic words in a set W of Chinese phonetic words and further parsing each word in the set W, against the FCWPL to identify an associated Internet Keyword Entry Point List (IKEPL), each node in the IKEPL pointing to an Internet Keyword (IK) having a phonetic spelling; and combining each IKEPL identified by parsing each word against the FCWPL to form a set R of IKEPLs, each of which points to an IK. However, in a related language processing method taught by Maruyama, Maruyama teaches on these limitations by teaching language processing of both full and abbreviated words (col. 7, ll. 53-61 and col. 8, ll. 15-31) and also a method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (col. 4, ll. 34-45 and col. 7, ll. 44-48). Maruyama teaches language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40) and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, ll. 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method taught by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

Art Unit: 2142

make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method taught by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, ll. 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, ll. 8-15). Tout and Maruyama teach an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group but do not explicitly teach "weighting each IK to form an ordered list of internet keywords (IK). However, in related art, Bates teaches an ordering of database search results wherein the search results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, ll. 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the sorting function taught by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as taught by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, ll. 29-39).

9. Regarding claim 4, the combination of Tout and Maruyama teach an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group, but does not explicitly teach a method for creating rules and assigning weights to keywords in order to provide a results lists that is sorted based on rules in conjunction with assigned weights. However, Bates teaches an ordering of database search results wherein the search

Art Unit: 2142

results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, lines 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the sorting function taught by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as taught by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, lines 29-39).

10. Regarding claim 5, Tout teaches the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, the steps being the determination of whether the notations are full phonetic spelling words or abbreviations of phonetic spelling words. However, Maruyama teaches language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 5, lines 53-62, col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an abbreviated input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method taught by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method taught by Tout. The

rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 5.

11. Regarding claim 6, as stated above for claim 5, Tout teaches the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations in order to obtain Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List and splitting the query string into one or more abbreviated Chinese phonetic spelling words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama teaches language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method taught by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method taught by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 6.

12. Regarding claim 10, the combination of Tout and Maruyama disclose an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group, but does not explicitly disclose a method for creating rules and assigning weights to keywords in order to provide a results lists that is sorted based on rules in conjunction with assigned weights. However, Bates discloses an ordering of database search results wherein the search results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, lines 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2142

art at the time of the applicants invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the sorting function disclosed by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as disclosed by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, lines 29-39).

13. Regarding claim 11, the combination of Tout and Maruyama disclose an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group, but does not explicitly disclose a method for creating rules and assigning weights to keywords in order to provide a results lists that is sorted based on rules in conjunction with assigned weights. However, Bates discloses an ordering of database search results wherein the search results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, lines 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the sorting function disclosed by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as disclosed by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to

Art Unit: 2142

be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, lines 29-39).

14. Regarding claim 19, Tout teaches the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of performing spelling error checks and automatically providing corrections to spelling errors. However, Maruyama teaches language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary in order to provide proper spelling of Chinese phonetically spelled words (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method taught by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method taught by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method taught by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

15. New independent claims 20 and 23 contain similar subject matter and are rejected under the same rationale as independent claim 1. New dependent claims 21-22 and 24-26 contain similar subject matter and are rejected under the same rationale as dependent claims 4-6 and 10-11.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 07 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the words "parse" and "weighting" do not appear anywhere in the cited references. Tout (US 6,182,148 B1) teaches traversing of an input string in column 5, lines 24-26 which is the same as a parsing function. Bates (US 6,873,982 B1) teaches the utilization of assigning weights to each result in column 14, lines 6-32. Therefore, the citing of these references against claim 1 and new claims 20 and 23 is proper because they teach the concepts of parsing and weighting.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa


BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER